

A4720

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

June 3

titled "Fair Trade: For Whom?" The editorial properly characterizes fair trade as being clearly against the public interest.

However, the editors make the mistake of assuming there is not much danger that the bill will become law. Quite to the contrary, unless the consumers and intelligent businessman of this country act with more vigor than they have in the past, they may very well find themselves shackled to a national fair-trade system. The editorial, which conforms with unanimous expression of editorial opinion in the country, is in opposition to the fair trade bill, H.R. 1253.

FAIR TRADE: FOR WHOM?

By a 20 to 9 vote, the House Commerce Committee has approved Representative OREN HARRIS' bill to legalize retail price fixing on a national basis.

By the simple expedient of issuing notices, a manufacturer or distributor of a branded product could require retailers, regardless of State laws, to sell the product at a specified price. Individual contracts with retailers aren't necessary. What's more, this latest version of the so-called fair trade laws would be far simpler to enforce than its predecessors. In fact, since the bill takes the form of an amendment to the Federal Trade Commission Act, the FTC is afraid it could be required to assist manufacturers and dealers in prosecuting violators, even though the FTC is dead set against the bill.

The bill is an obvious weapon to plug the loopholes of the McGuire Act, which permits States to use fair trade laws. But last year many manufacturers dropped factory-fixed prices when the State laws proved unenforceable. The Harris bill would solve that sticky problem.

Such a bill, backed by a powerful lobby of small retailers, has no place in the kind of economy we enjoy today. Perhaps in the depressed 1930's a case could have been made for fixing minimum prices on national brands. But there are already too many built-in ratchets in our economy that keep pushing prices upward—farm supports, protective tariffs, commodity subsidies, loan guarantees, wage escalators. The Harris bill would be another. It is an anachronism which, in the long run, would not help the manufacturer, the dealer, the national economy—or the consumer.

Fortunately, there is not much danger of the bill becoming law. But the philosophy behind it—which, in effect, legalizes price fixing—is dangerous. It is symptomatic of the kind of thinking that has given protection to too many special groups.

Liberals' Glow Gets Dim—Eisenhower Becomes Stronger President With Inflation Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1959

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial, entitled "Eisenhower Becomes Stronger President With Inflation Fight," from the

Rockford (Ill.) Register-Republic of June 1, 1959:

LIBERALS' GLOW GETS DIM—EISENHOWER BECOMES STRONGER PRESIDENT WITH INFLATION FIGHT

(By Raymond Moley)

The President's perceptible rise in popularity is due to a number of circumstances, past and present. So far as the immediate situation is concerned, the reasons are obvious. The big Democratic majority is caught in the net of past pledges and future ambitions. Liberal Democrats elected in the sweep of 1958 won votes by irresponsible promises. With little regard for what actually might be done, they offered panaceas for every ill. Fiscal realities were ignored. If they thought about it all, they assumed deficits to be inevitable and unimportant. With nothing very clearly in mind, they recklessly talked about better ways of keeping the peace of the world, and violently attacked the President and Secretary Dulles.

The fact that so many are greenhorns and of little stature makes things worse for their party and their experienced leaders. Speaker RAYBURN once said that he would much rather have a small than a large majority to manage in the house.

Many in the majority have real problems about the next election. In most cases they were elected in marginal districts, and at home there is a strong conservative and Republican opposition whetting the ax for 1960.

On the Senate side there are at least four presidential candidates—KENNEDY, JOHNSON, HUMPHREY, and SYMINGTON. Except for JOHNSON, none of these would be contenders if there were really notable and commanding figures in the party. The Democratic Party is rich in quantity but poor in quality.

Against this inchoate opposition the President's situation and qualifications stand out with great clarity. He doesn't have to worry about his own future. Moreover, in an appeal to the public he has a vast advantage. He is a single figure, understandable, able to speak for his party with authority. He has a national audience at all times. International affairs, which are so critical, permit him to have the headlines. The opposition is many things with many tongues. Hence the public is confused about what the alternative might be.

Most important, the President has seized an issue that everybody can understand—inflation. And the people of the country are worried. Specific pockets of inflation show that there is beginning an ominous "flight from the dollar"—land booms, reckless stock market activities by unsophisticated investors, city workers buying land in the nearby countryside, purchases on credit, and a shift in preferences in life-insurance buying.

At long last, the President is fairly free from the sort of advisers who have infuriated conservatives and regular Republicans. Nothing so impaired the President in the past as those who professed to help him. He is more sure of himself now. He has graduated from his novitiate in politics. Now the real character of the man is emerging from the fog of assistants and advisers.

And that real character is in the pattern of a sincere, liberty-loving American who has a feeling for the principles that Americans have lived by. He shuns the piling up of bureaucracy because he has been able to see its workings at home and abroad. He realizes that concentrated power in Washington is a dangerous thing. He even feels that the excessive growth of the President's power is not in the American tradition.

He is close to the fiscal management of the Government and realizes how difficult it is becoming for the Treasury to borrow money

in the teeth of increasing deficits. It is true that he has been an expensive President, but he has come to see the limits of spending. And after years of attempting to appease labor-union leaders and ultraliberals, he realizes that he can never win them to his party. At the moment he is angry over the nagging of the opposition, and that is not hurting his popularity with people who want, enjoy, and expect a show of fire in their leaders.

A few strong vetoes will help mightily to cement his advantage, and from all indications these will be coming before long.

The Soviet Cosmic Rocket

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 3, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, by now those who believe the Soviet, lunik or mecha was a hoax have had their say. The officials who are equally convinced it performed approximately as advertised have also been heard. There have been opportunities before the House Committee on Science and Astronautics for rebuttal and counterrebuttal. Short of a full disclosure by the Soviet Union, little more is likely to be gained by pursuing the subject.

The committee, of which I am a member, will write its report in due course. Personally I suspect that the editors of True magazine which carried Lloyd Mallan's articles wish they had done more independent checking of the material before printing it for national circulation.

Having heard a parade of witnesses, some with access to all the facts available and equipped with the scientific training to evaluate these facts, the conclusion is almost inescapable, as these witnesses have testified, that a Soviet rocket was launched, that it went to the vicinity of the moon, and that the only reasonable interpretation is that it is now in orbit around the sun.

The hearings have been instructive in a broader sense. They have brought forth many illustrations of the problems of scientific fact gathering, interpretation, and evaluation. They have also thrown some light on the general scope of Soviet scientific endeavors and capabilities. They illustrate a need for continued committee study of Soviet scientific programs, whose size and impetus give pause to our own policymakers. The hearings show the importance of the work this committee is conducting in study of our own science education and manpower needs, dissemination of technical information, research and development programs, use of computers, and a number of other matters.

Perhaps it is time that we turn from worrying over past Soviet accomplishments to steel ourselves for the surprises which lie ahead, and that we make sure our own house is in order to meet the challenges which will confront us.